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States in the Western United States are growing at rates outpacing the rest of the nation. This growth is placing pressure on communities to develop their current open space for residential or commercial use. As cities develop a comprehensive open space plans, several elements arise. One critical element is connectivity. This connectivity is most often realized in the form of greenways. In many cities these greenways contain urban trail systems that provide significant recreation and connectivity benefits.

This thesis investigates the current recommended models used to plan for greenway, synthesizes them into a recommended model process, and analyzes case
studies of four cities that have implemented urban trail systems against this model framework.

The case studies include cities in the West with populations between 50,000 and 100,000 that are not part of a greater metropolitan area with demonstrated planning and implementation of urban trail systems. This selection provides the most relevance to smaller cities in the West that are beginning open space planning efforts.

Developing a recommended model process will aid smaller communities in planning for greenways by providing a step-by-step process from concept to implementation. This guide can provide a roadmap for communities that do not have experience with these planning models and can be used by citizens and non-planning professionals as well.

Three critical factors arose that were common to all case studies. First, the need to follow a trail-specific planning process. The communities studied had all made efforts to plan for trails apart from their general or comprehensive plans. Second, the planning process must have a robust public participation process. This ensures that community needs are met and buy-in is achieved for the implementation process. Lastly, the early identification of trail corridors is essential to the long-term planning process. This ensures that there are no surprises for the community when implementation begins. These factors should receive particular attention from communities wishing to develop urban trail systems.
PUBLIC ABSTRACT

Urban Trail System Planning in the Western United States: An Analysis of the Trail-Specific Planning Efforts of Four Cities that Have Implemented Urban Trail Systems

Kenneth C. Richley

As the population in the West grows at rates outpacing the rest of the country, smaller communities begin losing their open space to development. To combat this, communities often begin planning for open space conservation. One component that becomes critical in this planning is the element of connectivity. If this element of connectivity is essential to a communities open space planning effort they must plan specifically for these connections. Greenways and particularly greenways that contain urban trail systems can be an essential way to make these critical connections.

This thesis investigates the current recommended planning methods for greenway-specific planning, develops a synthesized model process from these recommendations, and then analyzes case studies of cities that have implemented urban trail systems against this framework. This uncovers critical factors that communities need to pay particular attention to in their greenway-specific planning efforts. This thesis aims to provide guidance for smaller communities in the West so that they can adequately plan for greenways and urban trail systems to make critical connections in their community and in their open space network.


Since the aim is to provide guidance to smaller communities, case study cities were chosen that were easily relatable to these smaller communities. The case study cities were chosen using the following hierarchy: Cities in the West, population between 50,000 and 100,000, not part of a greater metropolitan area, and cities with evidence of current greenway planning and implementation.

This thesis found that there were several key factors that communities needed to follow to ensure a robust greenway and urban trail system. First, they need to follow a trail-specific planning process. The communities studied had all made efforts to plan for trails apart from their general or comprehensive plans. Second, the planning process must have a robust public participation process. This ensures that community needs are met and buy-in is achieved for the implementation process. Lastly, the early identification of trail corridors is essential to the long-term planning process. This ensures that there are no surprises for the community when implementation begins. These factors can play a role in helping communities to achieve a connected greenway system that contributes to a successful open space planning effort.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Western states are continuing to grow at rates outpacing the rest of the nation, with the top five fastest growing states being Nevada, Arizona, Utah, Colorado, and Idaho (Perry & Mackun, 2009). This growth is predicted to continue, with the West projected to grow faster than any other area of the country through 2030 (U.S. Population Projections, 2005). Much of the land-use planning discussion surrounding this growth is centered on the creation and preservation of open space as explained below. Kline (2006) sees these trends helping to motivate the current interest in open space preservation. Kotchen and Powers (2004) state that “The protection of open space from urban sprawl has emerged as one of the more pressing environmental issues in the United States” (p. 1). This is further illustrated by the number of ballot measures focused on open space preservation. In the ten years from 1988 to 1997 there was an average of 44 conservation finance measures per year placed on ballots across the nation. In the ten years from 1998 to 2007 there was an average of 164 ballot measures per year (Land Vote, 2011). One type of open space that is receiving particular attention is Greenways, and more specifically greenways that contain Urban Trail Systems (UTSs). A leading expert in greenway planning, Fábos, (2004) sees “the growth of greenway planning and implementation as the fastest among all planning and design activities in the United States” (p. 329).
This thesis is comprised of two parts: First is the research of the model process currently recommended to implement UTSs which results in a recommended Model Planning Process; second is the case study analysis of the planning process of four communities against this model framework, resulting in the identification of those steps in the Model Planning Process that are critical to implementation of UTSs. Because there is no vetted, universal planning process for trail-specific planning, this thesis has analyzed the planning models found in academic literature and developed by governmental planning agencies to compile a recommended process that is the synthesis of those found in the research. This recommended planning model is then used as framework to analyze the planning processes used by the cities chosen for the case studies. A systematic approach to reviewing the planning process offers insight into the steps critical for trail system planning and implementation.

Communities utilize different planning processes to achieve implementation of UTSs. They are often planned under the umbrella of open space planning as greenways and UTS’s are a subset of open space. This study uncovers the processes used in selected case studies then and compares them to the recommended Model Process derived from current academic and governmental publications. This results in a recommendation of critical process steps and a practical implementation guide that need to be present when communities wish to implement a greenways and UTS.

In response to increasing populations, communities in the West are continuing to face pressure to develop their current open space for residential and commercial use. This research can position them to understand all aspects of the process needed to plan
for and implement UTS. By outlining the planning process and the critical steps, the public, local leaders, and local planners can envision the scope of the process needed to implement UTSs in their community.

The Challenges of Defining Open Space

Because greenways are a subset of open space it is necessary to define open space in general and further define greenways specifically. It is difficult to find a consistent, inclusive definition of open space, as the definition is dependent on the context in which it is being discussed. Planning discussions focused on creating open space will look at open space differently than an assessments or inventories of a community’s current open space. Geographic context also plays a role in the definition; a more rural area will typically have a different definition than an urban area. In a local example, this is illustrated in the subtle differences in the Salt Lake County definition and the Salt Lake City definition. As defined by the Salt Lake County Open Land Trust Fund Advisory Committee (Salt Lake County, 2011, para. 1), open space “is a parcel of land in a predominantly open and undeveloped condition that is suitable for any of the following:

- Natural areas;
- Wildlife and native plant habitat;
- Important wetlands or watershed lands;
- Stream corridors;
- Passive, low-impact activities;
- Little or no land disturbance; and/or
- Trails for non-motorized activities”

In a more urban context Salt Lake City (2011) includes “small neighborhood parks and community gardens” (para. 3). Portland, Maine (2011) cites its Evergreen...
Cemetery as the city’s largest open space. When completing an assessment of open space, the Miami Valley (Ohio) Regional Planning Commission (2005) included schools and landfills as part of their open space calculations. Zinn (2004) uses a definition of open space that:

“…includes three subsets: Productive land, environmentally significant areas, and green space. Productive land includes farm and agricultural lands and resource lands such as forests. Environmentally significant areas include wildlife habitats, wetlands, and coastal lands. Green spaces include public open space inside urban areas, such as parks, and large tracts of undeveloped lands outside urban areas (p. 1).”

The Center for Green Infrastructure Design is a non-profit in Salt Lake City, Utah, focusing on environmentally responsible land-use planning. They utilize an open space analysis tool that includes most of the definitions of open space, and uses them in a single comprehensive method of analysis. The Center’s CEDAR approach addresses the Cultural, Ecological, Development, Agricultural, and Recreation definitions in a comprehensive open space evaluation. It also places a strong emphasis on the interconnectivity needed to create a robust type of viable open-space system.

Creating an all-inclusive definition of open space is not relevant to most discussions, as it would include all lands not commercially or residentially developed and include a vast number of individual definitions and subsets. Therefore each community must define open space as it relates to their individual development and conservation priorities. Analyzing the factors that are critical in the planning and preservation of all
types of open space would also be unlikely to yield conclusive results. This thesis focuses on a subset of all of the broad definitions found in the literature, namely greenways, and more specifically those that contain or are part of urban trail systems. Table 1. Subset of General Open Space Definitions Applicable to Greenway Planning, illustrates the subsets of the general open space definitions that this thesis will address. It shows that greenways and UTSs are one subset of open space that can be studied independently. These greenways are intended to be a part of an integrated, holistic open space planning process but at the same time need to have a dedicated planning process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Definition/Subset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Salt Lake County, 2011)</td>
<td>Trails for non-motorized activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Zinn, 2004)</td>
<td>Green space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Center for Green Infrastructure Design, 2011)</td>
<td>Recreational open space</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1 illustrates a typical UTS. This is part of a more extensive regional trail system and illustrates the greenway-specific open space definitions highlighted in Table 1. The trail connects natural open spaces, recreational open spaces and other regional trails.
Figure 1. Typical Urban Trail System showing connections to natural open spaces, other regional trails, and recreational open spaces. Adapted from Jordan River Parkway Trail Map, by National Park Service Rivers, Trails, and Conservation Assistance Program for the Jordan River Commission, 2011.
This thesis objective is not aimed at defining an overall planning process for open space or land use, but the approach assumes that the overall planning and land-use framework already exists and that an urban trail system has been determined to be an integral part of the overall open space and land planning model. There are comprehensive planning models that should be used to develop overall plans while the process discussed in this thesis is focused in planning efforts specifically for greenways and urban trail systems as part of the overall land planning. These comprehensive land-use planning models such as the ones detailed by Steiner (2000) and the Center for Green Infrastructure Design (2011) are discussed later for framework/context purposes.

Because greenways are a subset of open space they can be defined more precisely. This more precise definition will allow a case study analysis of the planning methods used to implement UTSs to result in stronger conclusions than a study of general open space planning. The literature provides definitions that are consistent but vary in their level of specificity. A general definition of Greenways is that proposed by Ahern (1995): “Greenways are networks of land containing linear elements that are planned, designed and managed for multiple proposes including ecological, recreational, cultural, aesthetic, or other purposes compatible with the concept of sustainable land use” (p. 134). Again, this thesis will focus on those greenways that have a recreational trail component. This is illustrated by the definition that Little (1990) proposes in his seminal book

*Greenways for America:*

**greenway (grēn’-wā)** n. 1. A linear open space established along either a natural corridor, such, as a riverfront, stream valley, or ridgeline, or overland along a railroad right-of-way converted to recreational use, a canal, a scenic road, or
other route. 2. Any natural or landscaped course for pedestrian or bicycle passage. 3. An open-space connector linking parks, nature reserves, cultural features, or historic sites with each other and with populated areas. 4. Locally, certain strip or linear parks designated as a parkway or greenbelt. [American neologism: green + way; origin obscure.] (p. 1).

Understanding the definition of open space is only one part of understanding the planning for open space. The benefits of open space must also be understood so that planners can tailor their planning efforts to the desired results or benefits.

Benefits of Open Space

Starting with the broad definitions of open space, the benefits associated with open space are as varied as the different types. As different authors and authorities list the benefits of open space those benefits shape the definitions and those definitions shape how planning for open spaces is approached. There are several major non-profit organizations dedicated to the preservation and creation of, and planning for open space. They each have a slightly different focus on what they see are the benefits of open space thus framing their motivation for the preservation and creation of open space. The following discussion details benefits as defined by several of the most influential organizations involved in open space conservation.

The Trust for Public Land is one of the leading non-profit land conservation organizations in the country. In 2011 alone they conserved over 131,000 acres adding to their total of more than 3,000,000 since 1972 (Trust for Public Land, 2011). The Trust for Public Land focuses on the economic benefits of open space and lists the following:
• Attract investment – Parks and open space create a high quality of life that attracts tax-paying businesses and residents to communities.

• Revitalize Cities – Urban parks, gardens, and recreational open space stimulate commercial growth and promote inner-city revitalization.

• Boost Tourism – Open space boosts local economies by attracting tourists and supporting outdoor recreation.

• Prevent Flood Damage – Floodplain protection offers a cost-effective alternative to expensive flood-control measures.

• Protect Farms and Ranches – Protecting agricultural lands safeguards the future of farming economies and communities.

• Promote Sustainable Development – Open space preservation helps communities prevent the higher costs of unplanned development.

• Safeguard the Environment – Open space conservation is often the cheapest way to safeguard drinking water, clean the air, and achieve other environmental goals (Lerner & Poole, 1999, p. 1).

The Rails-to-Trails Conservancy (RTC) is a non-profit organization that started in 1986, whose mission is to create a nationwide network of interconnected trails utilizing abandoned and currently active rail corridors. These rail corridors connect communities across the nation and are often one of the few remaining corridors in urban areas suited to
urban trail development. RTC works toward the health benefits produced by preserving this specific type of open space. RTC (2011) lists the following as benefits of rail-trails:

They encourage healthier, more mobile lifestyles by making possible places to walk, bike and more. They develop healthier economies by promoting tourism and local businesses, and increasing property values. They support a healthier climate and environment by making active transportation a viable alternative to the automobile. They contribute to healthier, more vibrant community interaction, connecting people to the places they live, work and play (“The Benefits of Rail-Trails”).

The Nature Conservancy (2006) focuses on the ecological benefits of preserving open space with the mission of benefiting “the plants, animals, and natural communities that represent the diversity of life on Earth…” (p. 5). In this context the recreational and alternative transportation benefits of greenways are seen as secondary to the ecological benefits. Labaree (1992) defines the benefits and functions of greenways as:

- Habitat for animal and plant species,
- Conduits along which people, animals, and plants move,
- Barriers for some species,
- Filters for animals, sediments, and nutrients from groundwater,
- Sources of water and seeds, and
- Ecological sinks for sediments and nutrients (pp. 9-10).

This ecological approach or focus on open space planning is the most prevalent approach in contemporary literature. There is a great breadth of work written on this topic. This literature spans a spectrum from small handbooks, such as How Greenways Work: A Handbook on Ecology (Labaree, 1992), to award winning texts such as Frederick Steiner’s The Living Landscape – An Ecological Approach to Landscape Planning (Steiner, 2000). The breadth of literature available is illustrated in Table 2. The simple
handbooks are intended for audiences such as the general public and local planning commissions. This is intended to strengthen the support for ecological planning from a more grass roots level or inform municipal government officials that have no planning background. The comprehensive texts are intended for planning professionals who have the ability to shape the entire land-use planning model for communities and regions.

These texts are designed to frame land-use planning and open space conservation in an ecological framework. These ecological approaches to land-use and open space planning result in a planning process that is best summarized by Steiner in the figure 2. (Steiner, 2000):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spectrum of Ecological Planning Approaches</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Description - A 49 page handbook that is intended as a guide for private citizens and public officials wishing to design and manage greenways to fulfill their ecological potential. The handbook sees protecting these greenways as a way to create long-term ecological gain. |
| Content – Contains chapters on: Ecological Impacts of Development’ Ecological Functions of Corridors – outlines six ecological functions of greenways, Greenways, Wildlife, and Water Resources – this chapter constitutes the majority of the handbook, discussing possibilities and limitations of planning for all six ecological functions of greenways, and Greenway Design and Management – details a more general set of issues involved in planning and designing greenways |
| A simple handbook meant for general public. |
**Greenway Planning: developing a landscape ecological network approach**  

Description – An academic paper that presents a “theoretical and methodological approach to greenway planning that accounts for regional biodiversity and systematizes the selection of greenway links.”

Content – A methodological approach that utilizes: land cover assessment, wildlife assessment, habitat assessment, node analysis, connectivity analysis, network generation, and evaluation. “Network analysis is an appropriate approach to greenway planning, as it provides a method of systematizing the relationship between elements that can serve as greenway nodes as well as accounting for the conditions of the potential links.”

---

**Landscape Ecology Principles in Landscape Architecture and Land-Use Planning**  
*(Dramstad, Olson, & Forman, 1996). Island Press*

Description – This book is intended to use simple tools to mesh government regulations, economic self-interest, and the land ethic. This handbook is based on Forman’s seminal work *Land Mosaics: The Ecology of Landscapes and Regions* (1995)

Content – The authors see the need for a succinct book to address the ecological aspects of land-use planning. Much like this thesis it is not intended to shape the worldview but to address specific topics in the larger planning process by listing key principles and examples that can be applied to design problems.
Tomorrow by Design: A Regional Design Process for Sustainability  
(Lewis Jr., 1996). Wiley

Description – “This book is for everyone who is interested in exploring an alternative process for reconciling explosive urban growth with our regional natural and cultural landscape forms.”

Content – “Once we recognize where all the known resources in a region are, we can see the patterns in which they occur. These patterns can guide how and where future growth can be placed to avoid destroying the essential resources that sustain life.”

Unlike the previous article, this book is intended to shape the foundation for land-use planning, and is intended to be a comprehensive process for regional planning.

The Living Landscape – An Ecological Approach to Landscape Planning  

Description – A 477 page text addressed “the growing urgency of environmental issues confronting human societies” and outlines how to “heal, enhance, and manage the life-sustaining processes of the planet and ensure the integrity and strength of the global environment that connects them.”

Content – This text takes the current linear planning process and forms an ecological context around the typical steps in the planning process. This ecological framework is intended to “suggest opportunities and constraints for decision making about the use of the landscape.”

As shown later, this planning process is similar to the trail-specific planning processes recommended in academic text and by governmental entities. Steiner explains the interactions between the process steps:
The heavier arrows indicate the flow from Step 1 to Step 11. Smaller arrows between each step suggest a feedback system and, in turn, change from the subsequent step. The smaller indicate other possible modifications through the process. For instance, detailed studies of a planning area (Step 5) may lead to the identification of new problems or opportunities or the amendment of goals (Steps 1 and 2). Design explorations (Step 9) may change the landscape plan, and so on. Once the process is complete and the plan is being administered and monitored (Step 11), the view of the problems and opportunities facing the region and the goals to address these problems and opportunities may be altered, as indicated the dashed lines (Steiner, 2000, pp. 10-11).

This obviously points to an iterative nature of the planning process. Steiner continues in the book to expand on each of these steps and indicates that “The method offered here has a landscape ecological – specifically human ecological – bias” (Steiner, 2000, p. 24).

**Figure 2.** Ecological Planning Model showing interconnectedness of the planning process. Steiner (2000).
There are several approaches that take a more comprehensive look at open space and land use planning. These comprehensive approaches balance the health, recreation, and ecological benefits in their analysis. The Center for Green Infrastructure Design uses the CEDAR method which sees the benefits of open space in a more comprehensive manner. Similar to Lewis’s regional planning method in *Tomorrow by Design* (1996), it recognizes the importance of economic development, recreation, and the preservation of cultural resources in creating an ecologically sustainable landscape. Both methods use a set of icons that can be used on maps to denote what Lewis (1996) terms Natural and Cultural Landscape Wealth (p. 75). These icons are used to engage the public in determining the importance of resources within their region. The CEDAR method distills Lewis’s set of several hundred icons to a manageable set that is more suited for public involvement. This distilled set of icons in the CEDAR method places Cultural, Ecological, Development, Agricultural, and Recreation benefits on equal footing in the analysis phase. This can serve to accomplish one of the most difficult tasks in open space conservation; building support. By placing benefits such as development and ecology on the same level during the analysis phase, disparate groups can begin forming a partnership at the early phases of open space discussions. While the CEDAR method places these types of open space on equal footing, it sees greenways as a the critical link between all types of open space; “Without the element of connectivity, open spaces are merely a series of unrelated open lands rather than an integrated, interconnected system” (Center for Green Infrastructure Design, 2011) Because these connections are crucial to a complete open space system, this thesis concentrates on the urban greenways and urban trail systems as components of a larger planning strategy for open space.
When looking at these benefits in the context of UTS, a subset of benefits can be created. The list of benefits of greenways is a smaller subset of those listed for open space in general. They provide an important role in the overall open space infrastructure. They provide the links and connections to the many other open space types listed in the broader definition. They also provide links to other public, cultural, and natural resources. They are sources of recreation and also sources of alternative transportation. In many cases they can provide numerous ecological benefits as well. Table 3 illustrates the benefits of open space specifically relating to greenways. This is also illustrated in Figure 1 showing a typical urban trail system. This figure highlights a section of the regional Jordan River Trail and illustrates not only the trail itself but many of the benefits discussed in Table 3. Benefits of Greenways, by highlighting: the trail, neighborhood connections, spur trails, connections to transit, restoration areas, parks, and recreation areas.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Benefits of Open Space relating to Greenways</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Trust for Public Land, 2011)</td>
<td>Attract Investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Revitalize Cities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boost Tourism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(The Nature Conservancy, 2006)</td>
<td>Conduit along which people move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ecological benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Rails-to-Trails Conservancy, 2011)</td>
<td>Encourage healthier lifestyle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promote tourism and local business</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase property values</td>
<td>Health benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide alternative transportation</td>
<td>Reduction in transportation costs and emissions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connect people to work and play</td>
<td>Supports local business and tourism</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**(Center for Green Infrastructure Design, 2011)**

---

**Current Open Space Planning Trends**

While the large, non-profit organizations, discussed earlier, focus nationally and even globally, communities have begun to realize the need to create and preserve open space on a local level. Research by Bengston, Fletcher, and Nelson (2004, p. 272) found that there has been a “remarkable growth in the number of state and local referenda on smart growth and open space preservation.” This is supported by the Trust for Public Land. They record the number of ballot measures across the country that are aimed at land conservation in their LandVote database (Land Vote, 2011). In the years from 1988-1997 there were an average of 44 ballot measures per year resulting in an average of $1.78B in funds being approved for open space conservation and implementation of trail and recreational facilities. In the years 1998-2007 the average number of ballot measures rose to 164 per year. The approved funding rose as well to an average of $9.3B per year. Kotchen and Powers (2004, p. 1) conducted an in-depth analysis of these referenda and found that: “Nearly 1,000 jurisdictions at the state, county, and local levels held open-space referenda between 1998 and 2003, and approximately 80 percent of these initiatives passed.”
Erickson (2004) states that more specifically that “Many cities in North America are attempting to implement connected greenway networks” (p. 1). This is supported by the number of ballot measures whose purpose is specifically to conserve or create greenways or trails. From 1988-1997 there were an average of 9.5 ballot measures per year that specifically mention trails or greenways as an objective and from 1998-2007 there were an average of 18.5 measures per year (Land Vote, 2011). This illustrates that greenway planning is being driven by not only planners and conservation organizations but is being driven and supported by local municipalities and the public. This shows the need to understand the process needed to plan these greenways to ensure successful completion of greenway and UTS visions.
CHAPTER II
CURRENT GREENWAY PLANNING MODELS

It seems little has changed in greenway planning in the past several decades. In 1969 Brooks concluded that: “The greatest barrier to the development of trails is finding suitable land” (1969, p. 2). She contends that one of the major responsibilities of the planning department is to maintain an inventory of potential sites. The reason for this is to be able to respond to potential demands made by citizens for trails and greenways. She also states that comprehensive trail plans are the exception rather than the rule. “Few governments have comprehensive plans for trail development, and, in fact, most trails seem to be the result of some individual or group seizing a development opportunity before it is lost” (Brooks, 1969, p. 2). Not much has changed since this was written in 1969. Erickson (2004) concludes that “coordinated greenway visions are lacking” (p. 1). This being said, there are communities in the urban west that have implemented more complete systems of greenways and UTSs and have comprehensive plans that anticipate growth and the completion of additional segments of urban trails.

A review of current greenway planning literature has found that there are few sources that comprehensively document the entire process. There are many sources that discuss the history and theory of greenways (e.g., Little, 1990; National Park Service, 1991; Rails-to-Trails, 1993) and many that address the design of greenways (e.g., Hellmund & Smith, 2006; Flink, Searns, & Olka, 2001; AASHTO, 1999), yet few that look at the entire process. Expanding the literature review has shown that recommended planning processes have been developed by state agencies, local county agencies, local...
health departments and transportation departments. There is little evidence of individual communities documenting the planning process they use to develop UTSs. This thesis reviews these academic and organizationally developed planning guides and compares them to the processes being used by communities that have developed and implemented UTSs.

**Academic Planning Models**

As mentioned previously there are few academic texts that present a comprehensive discussion of the trail planning process. A Portland State University study found that; “trail design and planning is not covered in most university transportation courses, with only five percent including any discussion of this topic” (Weigand, 2010, p. 7). This finding may be a result of the lack of academic texts that step through the process of trail and greenway planning.

In 1993, Flink and Searns published *Greenways: A Guide to Planning, Design, and Development*. This book is one of the few that takes a comprehensive look at the entire greenway planning process. They do contend that; “There is no single way to plan and implement a successful greenway.” However, concede that “The preparation of almost all greenway plans involves two key ingredients: a thorough investigation of the greenway project area and the involvement of the public” (p. 17). The chapters of their book define a process that encompasses the entire project cycle. In the author’s terms, this process is structured as follows:

- Envisioning Your Greenway
- Developing a Plan
• Partnerships: Organizing Your Greenway Effort
• Building Public Support for Your Greenway
• Funding Your Greenway
• The Greenway Design and Implementation Process

Additional chapters discuss management, liability and preservation of natural and cultural resources. In this case “Your” in the chapter titles, and throughout the book, refers to a committed greenway activist or group as opposed to a community’s city council, planning and zoning commission, or governing board. Flink and Searns spend considerable time on the “Developing a Plan” chapter in the book, and consider it an integral part of the process. They have documented a detailed process that will result in a comprehensive master plan for a specific greenway corridor (see Figure. 3). It should be noted that this process is for planning a specific greenway corridor and not a greenway system. They recognize the fact that this may be part of a larger local or regional trail system but have outlined a planning process for a single corridor. Ryan (1993) sees that the development of a plan means little if there are no implementation strategies. Comprehensive multi-use trail plans have little chance of success if they are not integrated into policy and planning documentation that are actually used by planners, engineers, and decision makers (p. 45).
Figure 3. The Greenway Planning Process. (Flink & Searns, 1993).
Governmental Planning Models

The majority of trail planning process literature is produced by governmental entities. This may stem from the planning process being so closely linked to regulations, ordinances, and zoning that dictates trail planning activities.

In 1992 the U.S. Department of Transportation – Federal Highway Administration commissioned a study of *Current Planning Guidelines and Design Standards Being Used by State and Local Agencies for Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities* (U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration, 1992). A part of this study investigated current planning processes in an attempt to define the state-of-the-practice. The consultant selected for the report was to review reference documents and contact state and local agencies to review and report on their development process. This included the planning, design and implementation of bicycle and pedestrian facilities. For the planning process the report reviewed state and local agencies planning guidelines and a draft copy of Flink and Searns – *Guidelines for Creating Greenways*. The report concluded that the current best practices included processes used or proposed by the State of North Carolina and the State of Florida.

The State of Florida provides a detailed flow chart of the process similar to Flink and Searns. This is shown in Figure 4. Also similar to Flink and Searns, this flow chart details points where public involvement is key. It should be noted that the North Carolina planning process shown in Figure 5 does not provide a flow chart detailing the process. In the details of the process there are several steps that advocate public participation in the process. The plan mentions having members of the public involved in
the advisory committee and having a public meeting to identify hazards but does not integrate the public input process into the overall process in the same manner as Florida. Both North Carolina and Florida are currently still using or recommending these planning processes to create bicycle and pedestrian trail systems.

*Major Public Participation Recommended

![Diagram of planning process]

**Figure 4.** State of Florida Comprehensive Bicycle Transportation Planning Process. (Florida Department of Transportation, 1982) referenced in (U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration, 1992, p. 21).
Another governmental model is used and promoted by the Chester County, PA Planning Commission (CCPC). They published their *Trail & Path Planning – A Guide for Municipalities* in 2007 (Chester County Planning Commission, 2007), which recommended several trail planning resources, only one of which is an academic text. The other three references were planning process guides created by State and local agencies, again illustrating the lack of academic texts available on this topic. The process that is recommended by the CCPC is a synthesized combination of these resources that was developed into the following planning model shown in Figure 6:
The reason given for developing the guidebook is to assist municipalities in planning for trails because they state that trail planning in Southeastern Pennsylvania is a relatively new field. They urge municipalities to approach trail planning “with all the seriousness of a highway project”, and encourage addressing trails in comprehensive plans, official maps, and zoning, subdivision, and land development ordinances (Chester County Planning Commission, 2007).

*Figure 6. Chester County Planning Commission Planning Process. (Chester County Planning Commission, 2007, p. 7).*
It should be noted that the CCPC plan outline shown in Figure 6 does not explicitly denote many of the steps that they recommend in the text of the document. For example, they do not denote public involvement in the process steps but in the text of the guidebook they state: “Regardless of the approach, all trail & path planning must include stakeholder and public involvement.” (Chester County Planning Commission, 2007, p. 89). They see the three key steps that require public involvement are: consensus on the concept, consensus on the corridor, and consensus on the alignment. They further outline a specific process for public involvement (see Figure 7). The CCPC also does not denote Inventory and Analysis as a specific step in the process diagram but outline a comprehensive inventory and analysis process within the guidebook. To make their process diagram more effective they should denote these specific steps in the process. In the analysis and synthesis of the model processes studied these steps are explicitly added to the process to accurately reflect the steps the CCPC recommends. This is shown in Figure 7.
Figure 7. Chester County Planning Commission – Public Participation Process. (Chester County Planning Commission, 2007, p. 90).

Recently, the Utah Department of Health (UDOH), in conjunction with the Utah Department of Transportation (UDOT), has developed a handbook entitled *Utah Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan Design Guide* (Utah Department of Health, 2011). This handbook guides communities in the development of a bicycle and pedestrian master plan. The outlined steps are:

**Identifying Goals and Objectives** – provides guidance for identifying 1) a purpose of the bicycle and pedestrian master plan, 2) goals and objectives of the plan, and 3) methods for integrating this plan into the community’s existing planning structure (p. 7).
Conducting an Inventory of Existing Conditions – The goal of this chapter is to identify the infrastructure, programs, and policies already in place for pedestrians and bicycles. An inventory of existing conditions will inform the discussion on current facilities and that improvements can be made (p. 21).

Public Involvement – identifies a range of activities designed to engage the public as part of a bicycle and pedestrian master plan. Activities can range from small meetings with city staff to larger interactive public workshops (p. 47).

This Public Participation section will not be a chapter in the final master plan, but similar to CCPC, UDOH stresses the creation of a public involvement plan that is to be used during the entire planning process. They identify places in each section of the planning process where the public needs to be engaged.

Analysis and Site Selection – outlines the process of identifying specific sites for improvements. Techniques for site selection are discussed, including ideas for public involvement activities, evaluating problem areas based on demographics and topical foci, as well as the use of more advanced modeling techniques (p. 63).

Planning and Design – presents a variety of design components for consideration and adoption of a pedestrian and bicycle plan and infrastructure (p. 77).

Project Selection and Prioritization – will build upon those by outlining how to pair specific facilities with priority sites (p. 137).

Implementation – outlines the specific details associated with implementing the projects in the bicycle and pedestrian master plan, including costs and ongoing funding needs, and provides a comprehensive outline of existing funding sources for bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure. Additionally, this chapter discusses project phasing as way to implement projects over time (p.151).
**Monitoring** – presents a framework for monitoring the success of bicycle and pedestrian planning efforts. It includes tips on benchmarking progress, engaging local advocacy groups, and continuing to generate interest in bicycle and pedestrian issues once a master plan is complete (p. 167).

**Recognition Programs** – highlights a variety of recognition programs that are available for both bicycle and pedestrian projects. The first section focuses on awards for bicycle and pedestrian planning, while the second section focuses on awards for implementation (p. 177).

It is important to note that in Flink and Searns, Florida, CCPC, and UDOH models, public participation is stressed. This was evident in many other planning processes uncovered during the review of current planning processes. In reviewing the details in the North Carolina process, there is no mention of public participation. However, the North Carolina process has an actual step that refers to implementing the projects. They discuss implementing long and short-range plans as well as reviewing policy to ensure compliance to the plan. Even with these differences these processes are very similar and representative of current planning models. These model planning processes will analyzed and synthesized into a recommended model planning process in the next section. This will in turn be used to evaluate the planning process used in the case studies.
CHAPTER III
MODEL PROCESS RESEARCH AND SYNTHESIS

The four model processes studied have several common characteristics. They all outline a process that will guide a community in developing a plan to implement a greenway or UTS. In many cases their guidance only differs in the order in which they recommend the process steps happen. All of the processes have five process steps in common:

1. Establish a Vision, Goals, and Objectives
2. Inventory and Analysis of Current Conditions
3. Develop Potential Alternatives
4. Evaluate and Select Preferred Alternatives
5. Develop Implementation Strategy

It should be noted that all processes stress public participation in the Inventory and Analysis and the Evaluate and Select Preferred Alternatives steps.

In researching and analyzing the model processes the following steps are recommended to complete a robust process:

• Develop the Planning Framework – North Carolina Department of Transportation recommends this step to ensure integration with other plans. It also sets expectations of the planning process for non-planning participants in the process. It can also serve as a framework for a proposal request if consultants are being used.
• Develop a Public Participation Strategy – All model processes stress public participation, however UDOH is the only process that recommends developing a public participation strategy. This is the most recent planning model and integrates much of the latest social media concepts in the public participation process. With the increased methods of public input and outreach, developing a strategy can increase the diversity of the public input thus strengthening the process.

• Plan Approval and Adoption – Formalizing this step in the process can create support from local leaders that understand they are part of the approval process.

• Develop Evaluation and Plan Review Process – This step creates the understanding that this is a living document that needs periodic review. Creating measurement metrics can focus priorities after the completion of the plan.

Finally, although all of the model processes and the recommended model process explicitly outline a linear process, they recognize the iterative nature of the planning process. This iterative nature most often manifests itself in the public participation process. As information is solicited from the public, or as analysis is completed, it is incorporated into most segments of the plan. Steiner’s Ecological Planning Model, shown in Figure 2, stresses the importance of the planning process being iterative and
shows Citizen Involvement as central to the process (Steiner, 2000). Steiner’s planning model, while accurately depicting this iterative nature, can be unnecessarily complex when presenting the planning process to the general public and local leaders. In the interest of proposing a straightforward recommended planning process, the iterative nature of the planning process will be implicit and not denoted on the process diagram.

Figure 8 summarizes the model processes and proposes a synthesis of this process. This synthesis utilizes the steps that are common to each process and also adds steps that are needed to be a robust process.
Figure 8. Model Process Analysis and Synthesis. Analysis of the recommended trail planning processes and their synthesis into a Model Process framework.
CHAPTER IV
CASE STUDIES ANALYSIS

Methodology

Given the variety of planning methods that are currently used, and the variety of tools used to implement these plans, a case study analysis of communities that have implemented greenway systems seems appropriate to address this research. A case study methodology is applicable to this research question because it has the ability to provide detailed explanations of real-life situations. The explanations of these situations, namely the processes used in planning for greenways and UTSs, are critical to determining what factors were most influential to the implementation of UTSs in the studied communities. The implementation of a greenway system is a complex process that can span decades from initial planning to on-the-ground implementation. The strength of a case study analysis is that it can provide a deeper understanding of a process as complex as that used to implement UTSs.

The planning process that this thesis is seeking analyze is influenced by many factors. Reviewing multiple cases highlights the influential factors in the process and thus strengthens the conclusions. If only one instance of a greenway implementation was studied, aspects of the complex process may not be used in the analysis, thus weakening the conclusions. Studying these multiple cases can lead to a general set of observations and conclusions. Also, by studying multiple cases, the number of factors studied can be reduced and the conclusions can be strengthened. When undertaking multiple case studies, Yin (1989) explains that “Every case should serve a specific purpose within the
overall scope of inquiry” (p. 53). This thesis will use what Yin terms a literal replication. Namely, the cases selected will test the same outcomes. In this instance; were there similar process steps present in all the cases to conclude that they were the steps that had the greatest influence on the implementation? An in-depth study of a small number of cases will allow for the greatest number of factors to be studied, again strengthening the conclusions.

The objective of this case study is to find communities that have implemented greenway systems and determine if there are consistent process steps that were both present and contributed to the completion of UTS in the studied communities. By identifying these factors a process can be built that stresses the importance of these critical factors and increases a community’s chance of success in implementing UTS.

One of the major obstacles of this research was developing a list of the process steps that need to be studied. If an important step is not considered in the data set, a critical link may be missed. Researching current planning processes in a more general sense should reveal steps that current practitioners regard as critical to implementation. Another obstacle is the availability of historical data regarding the process that was used when specific trail sections were completed. This is another reason to consider multiple cases in this thesis.

**Case Selection**

Many mid-sized rural communities find themselves facing the prospect of transitioning into larger more urban cities. In the western U.S. there are many of these communities that are not part of a greater metropolitan area (GMA), and do not benefit
from more large scale regional planning. The results of this thesis can aid these smaller communities in long range planning for greenways and UTS. Thus the following hierarchy was used to start the city selection process (see Figure 9):

**Figure 9.** Initial City selection hierarchy used to choose case study cities.

Using population data the first two filters resulted in 50 cities within the population guidelines. The next filter on the hierarchy (not part of a GMA), was chosen because, when cities are part of a GMA there are often regional planning efforts that can overshadow or replace a community’s need to plan for greenways or UTS. This can be evident on a county level or on a state level. This filter narrowed down the number of cities to 22. Several of these cities had developed trail systems, however the following
four case studies were chosen because they were able to provide enough data to support a complete case study analysis.

- **Bend, OR** – The Bend urban trail system currently has 51 developed miles, with more trails under construction each year (Bend Park and Recreation District, 2008).

- **Flagstaff, AZ** – has over 50 miles of urban trails, with more being actively planned as part of the Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS) (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2011).

- **Bellingham, WA** – currently has over 64 miles of urban trails, and a well-documented trails plan (City of Bellingham, 2008).

- **St. George, UT** – has over 35 miles of off-street multi-use trails, and has plans to more than double that amount (City of St. George, 2006).

**Data Collection and Analysis**

Urban Trail Systems are rarely imagined, planned, and implemented in a short time frame. This necessitates a review of the overall UTS planning process used currently and in the recent past. It also suggests that a chronological review of the planning process be completed for each case. The long time frame also suggests the possibility that different planning models could have been used for different segments of the overall UTS. Particular attention will be given to the first trail-specific planning effort in each community. It will be shown that many of the trail-specific planning efforts build on the initial effort, in particular their public input and corridor selection.
Trail planning process data will be collected by reviewing planning and zoning documentation, reviewing trail master plans, and researching city websites. The data will be organized in the following manner:

- Each case will begin with a brief dashboard outlining the community including: Population growth chart, miles of trails on the ground, first trail-specific planning effort, and current trail planning responsibilities. Trail miles were obtained by researching the current inventory sections of the planning documents throughout the years. In the case of St. George, this data was provided by the planning department for all trail segments.

- Past planning documents that relate to trails planning will be reviewed. Where specific planning processes are included in the documentation they will be noted. Note: some of the planning documents analyzed serve to only illustrate the support for trail planning. The pertinent documents are those that are specific to trail and greenway planning or have a substantial trail planning component.

- These pertinent documents from each case will be analyzed to show evidence that the trail planning process contains steps from the model process outlined in Figure 8 - Synthesis of Model Processes. This analysis will be represented graphically in charts titled – Analysis of Trail Planning Documentation. The resulting data will then be evaluated against the Model Process framework and conclusions drawn on the evidence of:
  - Omission of steps from the planning process
o Patterns and/or consistency of the process steps
o Progression of the planning documents
o Level of public participation in the planning process

• After each case is analyzed, general conclusions of the thesis will be presented to show evidence to what extent the planning processes of each case study utilize the process steps and outcomes in their past and current planning processes. The cases will be evaluated for:
  o Patterns and/or consistency among the case study conclusions
  o Patterns and/or consistency among the first major trail planning efforts for each of the case studies
  o Patterns and/or consistency among the latest trail planning efforts for each of the case studies

Bend, OR

The analysis of Bend, OR follows, starting with a community profile in Table 4 and followed by an outline of trail planning in the community in Figure 10. A synopsis of prior planning efforts is conducted in Table XX. This synopsis shows the progression of trail specific planning efforts that have led to the urban trail system in Bend. The analysis concludes with an analysis of these planning efforts using the developed model process as a framework.

This case study illustrates an example of a community that has integrated trail planning into local, regional and state agencies in a consistent and comprehensive manner.
Table 4

*Bend, OR Community Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails Planning Responsibility:</th>
<th>Bend Park &amp; Recreation District (BPRD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Major Trail Planning Effort:</td>
<td>1995 Urban Trails Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles of Trails:</td>
<td>65 (Bend Park and Recreation District, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Miles of Trails:</td>
<td>96 (Bend Park and Recreation District, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Trail Planning</td>
<td>City of Bend</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partners:</td>
<td>Oregon Department of Transportation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deschutes County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10 illustrates population, miles of trails, and when Bend started their first major trail specific planning effort. This information can be used by other communities to understand where they are in the trail planning and trail implementation process.

*Figure 10. Population Growth & Cumulative miles of UTS: Bend, OR.*
**Trail Planning Outline – Bend, OR.**

Both the City of Bend and the Bend Park and Recreation District (BPRD) currently plan for trails in the Bend Metropolitan area. The BPRD was established in 1974 by the Central Oregon Intergovernmental Council. The BPRD is the organization that is charged with acquiring land and conducting the planning process to implement trails in the Bend area. Planning is also done at a regional and state level by Deschutes County and the State of Oregon; however, they do not conduct the specific trail planning activities that result in implementation within the Bend area, but are partners in the efforts of the BPRD. The Deschutes County Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee is an appointed citizen committee that advises Deschutes County, the City of Bend, and other communities within Deschutes County.

Table 5 is a review of the prior trail planning efforts made by the city of Bend and the other trail planning partners. This review is intended to provide a background on the process that resulted in the current urban trail system in Bend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of prior planning efforts for Bend, OR</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bend Area General Plan (City of Bend, Deschutes County, 1975, 1998)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This plan was adopted by the City Council and the Board of County Commissioners. One of the Plans Goals is “to establish a system of trails, greenways and wildlife corridors that are interconnected” (p 2-2). The plan also contains a policy that states “The city and Bend Metro Park and Recreation District shall share the responsibility to inventory, purchase, and manage public open space, and shall be supported in its efforts by the city and county” (p. 2-12) This illustrates the interconnectedness of the planning process. The plan further states; “The Bend Metro Park and Recreation District shall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
acquire park sites and open space lands where possible to establish pedestrian, bikeway and greenway linkages between parks, open spaces, neighborhoods, and schools” (p. 2-13)

**BPRD – Comprehensive Plan** (Bend Park and Recreation District, 1981)

The plan was rewritten in 1995 to include the first inventory of trails, subsequently updated in 1998 and 2001. This plan was superseded by the Parks, Recreation, and Green Spaces Comprehensive Plan (BPRD, 2008). The trails outlined in the plan are shown in Figure 11. Note: As of 1995 none of the identified trails had been built.

**Bend Urban Trails Plan** *(City of Bend, 1995)*

This is the first plan for Bend that is dedicated solely to trails and trail planning. It was intended to enhance the trails portion of the Comprehensive Plan. It was funded by a grant from the Oregon Department of Transportation and the Department of Land Conservation and Development. The purpose of the grant was to study opportunities for multi-use trails to link activity centers and residential areas. The planning process used by Bend for the 1995 Trail Master Plan can be summarized as follows (steps with an * have a public participation component):

- **Form Trail Advisory Committee (TAC)*** - Consisting of Federal, State, and Local land management agencies, Trail and Bicycle advocacy groups, and the public. This TAC involved over forty members.

- **Trail Inventory** – On-the-ground trail inventory and potential connectivity. The consultant spent two months gathering background data and developing conceptual trail alignments. They met with utility companies, irrigation districts, and railroad companies to discuss their willingness to allow trails in their corridors. This inventory process resulted in thirteen Primary trails being identified. Secondary and Neighborhood trails were also identified.

- **Introduce Trail Plan*** - Solicit public input on trail identification and location – The public was asked to describe heavily used trails within their neighborhoods. This input was researched and incorporated into the Trail Analysis section.

- **Trail Analysis** – Comprehensive ranking analysis – The trail analysis consisted of a ranking process containing nine ranking criteria. This was used to rank the thirteen Primary trails resulting from the Trail Analysis section. This ranking was completed by four people reaching consensus on each point and then the ranking was reviewed by the TAC.

- **Design** – Utilizes resources such as AASHTO 1991, Flink and Searns 1993 – This section contains guidance for trail design. It outlines the different trail types that comprise the system. This is general information to ensure that the public as well as
funding sources are informed on the specifics of each trail. This section also aids in compiling accurate costs for each trail depending on trail type.

Develop Implementation Strategy

- Cost & Funding – This outlines all of the costs associated with constructing each trail segment. It aids in prioritization and determination of appropriate funding sources. It also aids in compiling municipal budgets by outlining labor and overhead costs required to maintain the trails on a per-mile basis. A detailed list of potential funding sources and funding mechanisms are included in this section. This provides a possible roadmap to overcome the daunting task of funding an extensive trail system that is outlined in the plan.

- Legal Issues – This section outlines the legal issues associated with acquiring land and completing trail sections. This is intended to guide the City in adopting ordinances and guidelines for dealing with trails in the future.

Future of Trails Plan * – Next Steps – This section recommends the adoption of the plan by the City of Bend as part of their Comprehensive Plan and Transportation Plan. It provides an extensive list of recommended policies that should be adopted to support the Urban Trails Plan.

Bend Riverway – A Community Vision (Bend Park and Recreation Foundation, 1999)

The study was conducted to develop a management plan for the Deschutes River. This corridor is the backbone of the Bend trail and open space system. Trails and trail connections were one of the main topics of interest in the plan. This plan can be considered in combination with the Deschutes River Trail Action Plan (2002). These plans together provide a complete plan for the Deschutes River Trail.

Deschutes River Trail Action Plan (Bend Park and Recreation District, City of Bend, Bend Park and Recreation Foundation, 2002)

This plan was adopted by the city of Bend and the BPRD. It resulted from and built upon the 1999 Bend Riverway Study and is focused on the individual segments needed to complete a trail along the Deschutes River and trail connections to the Bend Urban Trail System. This plan combined with the Bend Riverway Study form a complete planning process and are treated as a single planning effort in this thesis. The plan contained the following outline of the planning process:

Planning Process (Bend Riverway Study)

Planning Guidelines - Guiding Principles for the Riverway

The mission of the Bend Riverway is to promote the conservation and enjoyment of our
Guiding principles were developed by the Steering Committee to provide a framework within which the Riverway Project would operate. The Steering Committee considered these guidelines as a critical part of the process. The guiding principles are as follows:

Seek Common Ground
- Develop cooperative partnerships with agencies, private property owners, citizen and business groups
- Respect private property rights.
- Work within existing laws and regulations.
- Be a catalyst for good communication.

Build a Stronger Community Through Public Involvement
- Conduct extensive public outreach through a wide variety of methods.
- Actively engage all segments of the community.
- Develop a strong sense of river heritage in the community.
- Raise river awareness in order to foster stewardship.
- Focus on connecting neighborhoods and businesses to the river.
- Increase economic benefits to the community.

Envision a Legacy to Leave Our Children
- Build a community vision for the river within one year.
- Develop 5, 15 and 50-year goals.
- Maintain and enhance the quality of life in Bend.
- Protect the river's health.
- Sustain or increase economic vitality of Bend.
- Work creatively to protect the river using a variety of land preservation tools.
- Identify and interpret the historical, cultural and natural values of the river for future generations.

The Deschutes River Trail Action Plan continues the planning process and incorporates the following steps:
- Prioritized list of projects
- Individual project information
  - Site description
  - Project description
  - Land ownership character
  - List of potential partners
- Preliminary work required
  - Preliminary trail alignment
  - Definition of trail amenities
  - Property owner discussions if needed
- Construction project information
  - Program (what is to be constructed)
Conceptual level construction budget
  Construction timeline

- Project implementation steps
  - Funding sources
  - Project partners
  - Project schedule

- Project lead and support responsibility
  - Tasks, responsibilities, and schedule

- Project management and maintenance program

Outlining the planning process is a critical step in Developing the Planning Framework. It allows the public and all involved to anticipate the outcomes of the process and feel comfortable with being involved in the process.

*Parks, Recreation, and Green Spaces Comprehensive Plan* (Bend Park and Recreation District, 2008)

This is the guiding document for the planning and implementation of the UTS and Greenway system in the Bend area. It is a comprehensive plan that also includes all types of indoor and outdoor recreation. Through public outreach the BMPRD found that walking/biking trails are among the most important facilities to resident households.

*Park & Recreation Trails Master Plan* (Bend Park and Recreation District, 2008)

This plan replaces the 1995 plan and is built upon the 2006 Bend Urban Area Bicycle and Pedestrian System Plan, the 2005 Parks, Recreation and Green Spaces Comprehensive Plan and the 2002 Deschutes River Trail Action Plan. “The Plan recommends improvements that will upgrade the existing system where needed, fill in the missing gaps, and connect to significant environmental features, schools, public facilities, local neighborhoods, other parks, and business districts throughout the area.” The current Bend Urban Trail System map is shown in Figure 12. Planning steps noted in the 2008 Plan:

- Public Input – Trail prioritization and new trail opportunities were a result of public meetings with Neighborhood Associations.
- Goals & Policies (Objectives) – The plan states that: “The following goals were derived from existing plans and input from the district’s Trail Plan Advisory Committee members, BPRD staff, and district residents.”
- Existing Conditions/Inventory – Including a needs overview, inventory of existing conditions, and an analysis of opportunities and challenges.
- Selection Criteria – A selection criteria process was developed to evaluate and select preferred alternatives and develop priorities.
- Action Plans – action plans and capital improvement requirements were
presented for each identified trail section.

- Plan Adoption Resolution – BMPRD No. 306 – A RESOLUTION OF THE BEND METRO PARK & RECREATION DISTRICT BOARD OF DIRECTORS ADOPTING THE 2008 BMPRD TRAILS MASTER PLAN. This formalized the adoption of the plan.

The results of these planning efforts have produced the current Bend Urban Trail System map shown in Appendix A.
Figure 11. Trails Shown on the 1981 Bend Comprehensive Plan Map. (City of Bend, 1995, p. 6a).
Analysis against Model Process Framework.

Figure 12 outlines the trail specific planning documents and compares them to the recommended model process. Explicit evidence that specific process steps and process step outcomes have occurred are noted.

In analyzing the case against the model framework, evidence of the following are verified:

• Omission of steps from the planning process
• Patterns and/or consistency of the process steps
• Progression of the planning documents
• Level of public participation in the planning process

Omissions - The most significant omission from the Bend planning documents was in the Develop Evaluation and Plan Review Process, Model Process step. Only the 2008 plan addressed the Review Schedule outcome of this step. There was also no evidence that the plans addressed trail opportunities associated with planned transportation improvements.

Patterns/Consistency - All plans showed evidence that they established the planning framework. All plans stress the need for connectivity within the urban trail system. All plans showed well documented evidence of prioritizing the identified potential trail segments. The Implementation Strategy Development showed some consistency but there was not evidence that all outcomes were completed during each planning process.
Progression - The 1995 plan was facilitated and prepared by a consultant. There was not evidence that nine of the Model Process outcomes were completed during this planning process. The current plan was prepared by city staff and there were only five outcomes that had no evidence of completion during the planning process.

Public Participation - Although the process for the 2008 plan is not as rigorous as the 1995 process, public participation is still a key component to the process. Input was solicited thorough the Bend Neighborhood Associations, through email, and at district presentations. The extent of the Technical Advisory Committees and Citizen Advisory Committees involvement is significantly different from the 1995 plan. The 1995 TAC contained over 40 members and the TAC for the 2008 plan contained three. There were eight members on the Citizen Advisory Committee for a total of eleven. This is significantly less than the 1995 plan. This illustrates the reliance on past planning efforts and the progression of the planning effort.

General Observations - Even though the 1981 Comprehensive Plan included a map outlining potential trails, none of the trails that were identified in the plan were built as of 1995. At this time the City of Bend obtained a Transportation Growth Management planning grant from the Oregon Department of Transportation. This grant was used to create a trail-specific plan that was focused on opportunities for multi-use trail to link activity centers and residential areas over the next 20 years. At that time the City hired a consultant to facilitate the process, collect & analyze the data, and prepare the plan. This resulted in the Bend Urban Trails Plan and would be the first time that the trail plan was
a stand-alone document that focused solely on trails, and can be considered the first time that trail planning was completed separately from a larger land-use planning effort.

The trails outlined in the 1981 plan, however, created a starting point to bring continuity to the vision of an urban trail system in Bend. This urban trail system concept is reference throughout the planning documentation from the early plans to the present.
### Analysis of 1995 Bend River Trails Plan

**Model Process**
- Develop the Planning Framework
  - Key Task: Review and develop the objective of the plan; solicit input from residents and stakeholders; review and designate key trails and trail segments.
  - Plan Development Task: Develop a list of trail segments.
  - Project implementation: Planning and design.

**Model Process Outcomes**
- 1995 Bend River Trail Master Plan
- 1995 Bend River Trail Plan
- 1995 Bend River Trail Plan Outline

- **Factors for Considering Deschutes River Master Plan**
  - Trail Segments
  - Trail Characteristics
  - Trail Alignment
  - Trail Use

- **Criteria**
  - Trail Segments
  - Trail Characteristics
  - Trail Alignment
  - Trail Use

**Analysis of 1995 Bend River Trails Plan**
- **Focus of the Plan**
  - **Objective:** Develop a Comprehensive Trail System for Bend, Oregon.
  - **Methods:** Public involvement, trail surveys, and public meetings.
  - **Outcomes:** 1995 Bend River Trail Master Plan.

**Analysis of 2001 Trail Master Plan**
- **Focus of the Plan**
  - **Objective:** Develop a Comprehensive Trail System for Bend, Oregon.
  - **Methods:** Public involvement, trail surveys, and public meetings.
  - **Outcomes:** 2001 Bend River Trail Master Plan.

**Analysis of 2008 Trail Master Plan**
- **Focus of the Plan**
  - **Objective:** Develop a Comprehensive Trail System for Bend, Oregon.
  - **Methods:** Public involvement, trail surveys, and public meetings.
  - **Outcomes:** 2008 Bend River Trail Master Plan.

---

---

**Figure 12. Analysis of Trail Planning Documents vs. Model Process - Bend, OR.**
Flagstaff, AZ

The analysis of Flagstaff, AZ follows, starting with a community profile in Table 6 and followed by an outline of trail planning in the community in Figure 13. A synopsis of prior planning efforts is conducted in Table 7. This synopsis shows the progression of trail specific planning efforts that have led to the urban trail system in Flagstaff. The analysis concludes with an analysis of these planning efforts using the developed model process as a framework.

This case study illustrates an example of a community that has branded their urban trail system. Flagstaff has used the acronym FUTS (Flagstaff Urban Trail System) consistently for several decades which has increased public awareness of the system.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Flagstaff, AZ Community Profile</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trails Planning Responsibility:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles of Trails:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Miles of Trails:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Trail Planning Partners:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13 illustrates population, miles of trails, and when Flagstaff started their first major trail specific planning effort. This information can be used by other communities to understand where they are in the trail planning and trail implementation process.

![Graph showing population growth, cumulative miles of trails, and the first trail planning effort in Flagstaff, AZ.](image)

**Figure 13.** Population Growth & Cumulative miles of UTS: Flagstaff, AZ.

**Trail Planning Outline – Flagstaff, AZ.**

The City of Flagstaff currently plans for trails under the Flagstaff Urban Trails System (FUTS). The city has addressed the topic of urban trails in numerous documents during the past two decades. They have the largest number of separate planning documents that address trails of any of the case studies. They use the *Flagstaff Area Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan (RLUTP)* (City of Flagstaff, 2001) to drive goals and objectives for the *Flagstaff Open Spaces Management Plan* (City of Flagstaff,
2007). It also drives the *FUTS Trail Priority Evaluation* (City of Flagstaff, 2011).

However, the *RLUTP* relies on previous planning efforts to derive the goals for the FUTS. Twenty four area and master plans are listed in the reference list of the *RLUTP*. Many of these plans support the same goals of creating a cohesive urban trail system for Flagstaff.

Table 7 contains descriptions of past planning efforts and how they relate to trail planning. Much of these descriptions are taken from the current *Flagstaff Open Spaces Management Plan* (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2008). Discussing the planning efforts of the past two decades in the current planning document helps to put the current trail planning efforts into context.

---

**Table 7**

*Review of prior planning efforts for Flagstaff, AZ*

*Growth Management Guide 2000* (City of Flagstaff, 1987)

“In 1987, the city recognized that “the preservation of open space is important in enhancing a community’s quality of life. Open space has a functional use as a land resource, as a land use for recreation, and as a corridor for transportation”. Because many parcels that were then undeveloped would eventually be developed, the *Growth Management Guide 2000* (GMG) urged that “it is imperative that the City embark on a program of preserving quality open space within the urban areas of the City”” (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2008, p. 4)

“In addition, the *GMG 2000* called for the creation of a safe and efficient city-wide bicycle and pedestrian system for commuting and recreational purposes.” (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2008, p. 4)
**Final Report – Flagstaff Urban Trails System Ad Hoc Committee** (City of Flagstaff, 1988)

The plan was meant to identify recreational and alternative transportation options for Flagstaff. The Ad hoc committee was appointed by City Council to “study and make recommendations pursuant to implementation of a City-wide Urban Trails System.” (p. 7)

**Flagstaff Bicycle Plan** (City of Flagstaff, 1991)

This was intended to cover a wide range of issues including: facility development, education, advocacy, enforcement, registration, funding, and implementation. It was meant to be the vehicle the city used to implement bikeways in the city. Although the plan was bikeway specific it addressed Type 1 bikeways which are separated path urban trails that would eventually become part of the urban trail system.

**Long Range Master Plan for Parks, Recreation and Open Space** (Flagstaff Parks and Recreation Division, 1996)

“Open spaces are to provide a setting for outdoor recreation, such as walking, jogging, bicycling, and wildlife viewing. The Master Plan also notes how open spaces contribute to maintaining Flagstaff’s identity: “Open spaces in Flagstaff enhance the city’s image as a ‘community in the forest.’” Among its recommendations is this: “Designate all city-owned lands adjacent to the Rio de Flag and its tributaries as greenbelt lands”” (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2008, p. 5).

**A Vision for Our Community: Flagstaff 2020** (City of Flagstaff, 1997)

“Looking ahead to the year 2020, A Vision catalogs several aspirations: that most community residents live within a 15-minute walk of an open space access point, that designated urban open spaces and greenways are permanently protected, and that selected Forest Service and State Trust lands are permanently protected for open space use. Here is another goal: that within an urban growth boundary, all land “has been clearly designated for future development or [for] protection as open space”” (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2008, p. 5).

**Flagstaff Area Open Spaces and Greenways Plan** (City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, 1998)

“In the words of its executive summary, “The primary goal of the Plan is to maintain Flagstaff’s quality of life by finding ways to balance development with the retention of
open spaces and natural areas.” At the heart of the document are lists of lands recommended for retention as open space and their priority level in a four-point hierarchy. The focus was on lands that lay outside Flagstaff’s urban area at the time of its publication in 1998”” (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2008, p. 5)

Flagstaff Area Regional Land Use and Transportation Plan (City of Flagstaff, Coconino County, 2001)

“This plan recognizes two distinct open space plans. The Rural Open Spaces Plan addresses areas that lie outside the urbanized area of Flagstaff but are connected (or should be connected) to the urban open spaces. Fundamentally, that plan is the Flagstaff Open Spaces and Greenways Plan of 1998, which is explicitly incorporated into the Regional Plan. The Urban Open Spaces Plan lays the groundwork for identifying and protecting open spaces within urban Flagstaff”’ (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2008, pp. 5-6) The plan has a specific section relating to the FUTS plan and identifies remaining connections and linkages needed to complete the plan. It also drives the FUTS Trail Priorities report generated as a separate part of the planning process.

FUTS Trails Priorities Report (Flagstaff Metropolitan Planning Organization, 2011)

A summary of the comprehensive, systematic, and public process used to set priorities for construction of future FUTS trail segments. The priority rankings are used to determine which trails the City builds first; the highest priority trails are programmed in the City’s five-year capital plan, which in turn is used to determine annual budget requests and grant funding applications. The current Flagstaff Urban Trail System can be seen in the map in Appendix B.

Analysis against Model Process Framework.

Figure 14 outlines the trail specific planning documents and compares them to the recommended model process. Explicit evidence that specific process steps and process step outcomes have occurred are noted.

In analyzing the case against the model framework, evidence of the following are verified:
• Omission of steps from the planning process
• Patterns and/or consistency of the process steps
• Progression of the planning documents
• Level of public participation in the planning process

*Omissions* - The only consistent omissions are that utility and abandon corridors are not explicitly discussed in the planning documents, and that there are no evaluation criteria for the success of the plan. Because most of the routes have been long established in prior planning efforts, the need to address utility and abandon corridors may not be relevant to the identified routes. Because the prioritization process is tied to the capital improvement budget the evaluation of the success of the planned implementations may be discussed in a different forum.

*Patterns/Consistency* - All plans have strong selections of preferred alternatives and strong implementation strategies. They have developed prioritization criteria, prioritization lists, and potential funding sources. Although all of the plans did not address utility and abandon corridors, the inventory and analysis of existing routes was robust. As mentioned earlier this omission may have been a result of earlier planning analysis that concluded that there was no need for this type of corridor.

*Progression* - All plans appear to address the process steps consistently through the years. This may be as a result of the institutionalization of the Flagstaff Urban Trail System into the variety of land-use planning efforts. There has been a consistent message of supporting FUTS since 1988.
Public Participation - Although there was not always evidence that the public participation strategy was developed as a specific process step, there was evidence of strong public participation continuing throughout the years and in both trail-specific planning documents and general land-use planning documents. For all of the planning processes there was strong evidence of extensive public participation. This participation ranged from representation on the steering committees to public input meeting throughout the process. It is unclear if this public participation was a result of the planning process or was a driver of a more inclusive planning process.

General Observations - In evaluating all of the case study cities, Flagstaff has the most consistent branding and institutionalization of their urban trail system. FUTS is consistently mentioned and supported in both trail-specific and general land-use planning documents for both Flagstaff and the regional community as well. The early establishment of trail corridors and articulating the goals of the Flagstaff Urban Trail System weave a continuous thread through the early and current planning documentation. The FUTS goals are referenced in all the planning documentation reviewed.
**Figure 14. Analysis of Trail Planning Documents vs. Model Process - Flagstaff, AZ.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop the Planning Framework</td>
<td>Establish the planning context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Identify location and purpose for planning and development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Prepare a list of criteria for the planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conduct public hearings and workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review and incorporate the feedback from the community and other stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop a Master Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish the planning goals and objectives</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning methodology</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Establish the planning process</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning report</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning action plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning budget</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning schedule</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning organization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning communication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning advocacy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning involvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning partnerships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning funding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
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<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning evaluation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning implementation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Develop the planning monitoring</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bellingham, WA

The analysis of Bellingham, WA follows, starting with a community profile in Table 8 and followed by an outline of trail planning in the community in Figure 15. A synopsis of prior planning efforts is conducted in Table 9. This synopsis shows the progression of trail specific planning efforts that have led to the urban trail system in Bellingham. The analysis concludes with an analysis of these planning efforts using the developed model process as a framework.

This case study also illustrates an example of a community that has a strong regional planning effort that includes county and state planning efforts.

Table 8

*Bellingham, WA Community Profile*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails Planning Responsibility:</th>
<th>City of Bellingham</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Major Trail Planning Effort:</td>
<td>1995 Urban Trails Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles of Trails:</td>
<td>64 (City of Bellingham, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Miles of Trails:</td>
<td>70 (City of Bellingham, 2008)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Trail Planning Partners:</td>
<td>Whatcom County</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15 illustrates population, miles of trails, and when Bellingham started their first major trail specific planning effort. This information can be used by other communities to understand where they are in the trail planning and trail implementation process.
The City of Bellingham Parks and Recreation Department currently plans for trails in Bellingham. There are several ancillary groups that support this effort as well. These trail planning efforts are combined into the Parks, Recreation, & Open Space chapter of the comprehensive plan. There is, however, a regional trail system (the Coast Millennium Trail) that is part of Bellingham’s urban trail system and it is planned in greater detail as a separate planning process. Trail corridors have been mentioned in various plans for Bellingham since the 1980’s, however those corridors did not include North Bellingham until a separate plan was created in 2008 specifically adding trail corridors in North Bellingham. With this addition a complete picture of an interconnected trail system was realized for Bellingham.

Figure 15. Population Growth & Cumulative miles of UTS: Bellingham, WA.
Table 9 is a review of the prior trail planning efforts made by the city of Bellingham and the other trail planning partners. This review is intended to provide a background on the process that resulted in the current urban trail system in Bellingham.

Table 9.

Review of prior planning efforts for Bellingham, WA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plan</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open Space, Parks, and Recreation Plan</td>
<td>City of Bellingham, 1994</td>
<td>Seventeen major trail corridors are outlined in the plan. Many of these were outlined in The Bellingham Plan. This is included as part of the comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>City of Bellingham, 1995</td>
<td>The plan included an extensive trails component that was completed as a separate plan and inserted into the comprehensive plan. It outlined existing and potential trails and corridors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coast Millennium Trail Master Plan</td>
<td>Whatcom County Parks &amp; Recreation, Bellingham Parks &amp; Recreation, Port of Bellingham, Whatcom County Council of Governments, 2000</td>
<td>This is a plan outlining a specific trail that while regional in nature, will become part of Bellingham’s urban trail system. It is a planning effort aimed at identifying routes for this trail and funding sources.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006 Bellingham Comprehensive Plan</td>
<td>City of Bellingham, 2006</td>
<td>This plan contains the 2008 Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan as a chapter within the plan. There are also general trail-specific goals that support the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan within both the transportation element and the capital facilities element of the comprehensive plan.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Whatcom County Comprehensive Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan (Whatcom County, 2008)

A countywide, comprehensive plan that addresses all types of recreation. The plan includes a trails section and Trail Design Standards and detailed cost estimates for identified trail segments. This plan contains the following objectives or outcomes of the planning process:

1. Define the setting
2. Inventory Assets
3. Forecast Demand
4. Identify appropriate roles and responsibilities
5. Develop the elements of a regional countywide plan*
6. Determine the costs
7. Define an implementation program
   1. Adopt the plan Countywide
   2. Adopt the plan locally
   3. Implement program financing strategies
8. Determine Public Opinion (p. 1)

North Bellingham Trail Plan (City of Bellingham, 2008)

This arose from a community need to identify trail corridors in an underserved section of Bellingham. It became an appendix in the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (City of Bellingham, 2008) which is a chapter in the comprehensive plan.

Parks, Recreation and Open Space Plan (City of Bellingham, 2008)

This is a comprehensive plan for several types of recreation opportunities. It contains an extensive trails section and multiple objectives for trail system development and implementation. The current Bellingham Urban Trail System is shown in Appendix C, and the Proposed trails are identified Appendix D. Cost and funding are detailed in the current plan.
Analysis against Model Process Framework.

Figure 16 outlines the trail specific planning documents and compares them to the recommended model process. Explicit evidence that specific process steps and process step outcomes have occurred are noted.

In analyzing the case against the model framework, evidence of the following are verified:

- Omission of steps from the planning process
- Patterns and/or consistency of the process steps
- Progression of the planning documents
- Level of public participation in the planning process

Omissions - As in other cases there are no evaluation criteria to measure the success of the plan against the goals, objectives, and implementation goals. In the 2006 Comprehensive Plan capital facilities element, there was a review of the projects that were listed in the 1995 plan and their status, but there was no evaluation of the success of the efforts between 1995 and 2006. There is also not discussion of design standards in the later plans. I was unable to find evidence that these design standards were outlined in other planning documentation. Because these standards were outlined in the 1995 plan and many miles of trails are already constructed, there may not be a need to articulate the specific trail types in this document.

Patterns/Consistency - All plans develop a public participation strategy by defining roles of the committees and outlining the public participation process. All plans establish
a vision, goals, and objectives for the urban trail system. They contain all outcomes of that process step.

**Progression** - The 2008 *Parks, Recreation, and Open Space Plan* contains more complete process steps than the other plans. The most significant change in the latest planning effort is the robust nature of the implementation strategy. The latest plan includes all of the outcomes recommended for this process step. There is also evidence that a more complete analysis of all possible corridors is completed in the current plan.

**Public Participation** - Public participation has been robust in all the Bellingham plans evaluated. There appeared to be no decrease in the level of input sought from the public. Both the 1995 plan and the 2008 plan solicited public input throughout the process from initial needs assessments to final approvals. There is evidence that the *North Bellingham Trail Plan* was a result of public demand. As mentioned in the Flagstaff analysis, further study would be needed to determine if the initial trail planning was the result of public demand or if the inclusive planning process resulted in the robust public participation.

**General Observations** - As mentioned in the Flagstaff case analysis, the planning for trails and a strong public involvement component appear to be institutionalized in the Bellingham planning process. Unlike Flagstaff, however, there is continuing evaluation of potential new corridors as shown by the *North Bellingham Trail Plan*. This plan identifies new corridors and is seamlessly integrated into the current planning document. This institutionalization of the trail planning process keeps trails as a high priority in the community. These trail corridors are identified in the early planning and provide continuity through to the current planning.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop the Planning Framework</td>
<td>Structure of the planning document</td>
<td>The structure of the document is outlined.</td>
<td>Structure not outlined.</td>
<td>Structure outlined and similar to previous plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the planning document</td>
<td>The purpose of the plan is outlined.</td>
<td>Purposed of the plan is discussed.</td>
<td>Purpose outlined.</td>
<td>Brief discussion of interaction with other plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interaction with existing plans</td>
<td>The public interaction with other plans is noted and an outline of the planning process is given.</td>
<td>Discussion of interaction with other plans.</td>
<td>Discussion of interaction with other plans.</td>
<td>Brief discussion of interaction with other plans.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Develop Public Participation Strategy</th>
<th>Communication with decision-makers and working groups</th>
<th>Outline of meetings, surveys, and audits.</th>
<th>Communication and subcommittees outlined.</th>
<th>Communication and subcommittees outlined.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Vision, Goals, and Objectives</td>
<td>Overall goals of the UTS planning process</td>
<td>Visual and goals of the UTS are given.</td>
<td>Goals and Objectives of the UTS outlined.</td>
<td>Goals for the trail portion of the plan outlined.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory and Analysis of Current Conditions</td>
<td>Identifying factors</td>
<td>Specific actions are identified.</td>
<td>Specific actions for the planning process.</td>
<td>Specific actions for the planning process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Potential Alternatives</td>
<td>Identify factors</td>
<td>General Design Standards are included.</td>
<td>General Design Standards are included.</td>
<td>General Design Standards are included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and Select Preferred Alternatives</td>
<td>Identification criteria</td>
<td>No specific prioritization criteria noted.</td>
<td>Prioritization criteria listed.</td>
<td>No evidence found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Implementation timeline</td>
<td>No specific time is indicated.</td>
<td>List of corridors and specific sections included.</td>
<td>List of corridors and specific sections included.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Approval and Adoption</td>
<td>Final Public Input</td>
<td>Plan final adoption.</td>
<td>Plan final approval.</td>
<td>Plan final approval.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Evaluation and Plan Review Process</td>
<td>Final implementation criteria</td>
<td>No evidence of implementation being addressed.</td>
<td>No evidence found.</td>
<td>No evidence found.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16.** Analysis of Trail Planning Documents vs. Model Process - Bellingham, WA.
**St. George, UT**

The analysis of St. George, UT follows, starting with a community profile in Table 10 and followed by an outline of trail planning in the community in Figure 17. A synopsis of prior planning efforts is conducted in Table 11. This synopsis shows the progression of trail specific planning efforts that have led to the urban trail system in St. George. The analysis concludes with an analysis of these planning efforts using the developed model process as a framework.

This case study also illustrates an example of a community that has only recently begun trail specific planning efforts but has managed to quickly implement trails in the community.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trails Planning Responsibility:</th>
<th>City of St. George</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st Major Trail Planning Effort:</td>
<td>1994 Parks Master Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Miles of Trails:</td>
<td>50 (City of St. George, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned Miles of Trails:</td>
<td>105 (City of St. George, 2006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting Trail Planning Partners:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17 illustrates population, miles of trails, and when St. George started their first major trail specific planning effort. This information can be used by other communities to understand where they are in the trail planning and trail implementation process.
Figure 17. Population Growth & Cumulative miles of UTS: St. George, UT.

Planning Outline – St. George, UT.

The City of St. George is the current trail planning authority. They plan for trails as a subset of their Parks, Trails, Recreation, & Arts Master Plan. They do not plan for trails specifically in a trails master plan. They currently title their current and proposed trails map their Tails Master Plan. The current trails section of their plan highlights future trails and sets priorities.

Table 11 is a review of the prior trail planning efforts made by the city of St. George and the other trail planning partners. This review is intended to provide a background on the process that resulted in the current urban trail system in St. George.
Table 11

Review of prior planning efforts for St. George, UT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks Master Plan (City of St. George, 1994)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In survey of users Trails &amp; Bike Paths ranked higher than all other recreational amenities sought by residents. Plan resulted in an $18M bond that allowed for city funds to be used for trails and as grant match dollars. Even though this plan was relatively small an extensive public survey was taken. The plan also included an inventory of existing conditions, recommendations for future improvements, and estimated costs. The plan relied heavily on National Recreation and Park Association (NRPA) standards as a basis for evaluation and recommendations. It should be noted that trail miles per resident or access to trails was not a component in the NRPA standards. The recommendation listed in the plan was “1 system per region” with no recommendations given for trail miles. Even with this lack of concrete recommendations by NRPA, city staff relied on survey results and advocated for additional urban trails. Final recommendations call for 6 miles of trails at a cost of $443K. This is less than 2% of the total recommended monies required for the total list of park and facility recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parks, Trails, Recreation, &amp; Arts Master Plan (City of St. George, 2006)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The first plan for St. George that calls out Trails in the plan title. A comprehensive plan that has an extensive public participation component. It contains much of the Model Process content. In the public survey Trails were listed as the most desired “New Activity” and “New Facility” desired by residents. 78% of residents state that they use the existing trail system and 56% list connecting gaps in the system as the most needed improvement, and 36% feel linking neighborhoods is the most needed improvement. This plan has resulted in the St. George Urban Trail System map shown in Appendix E.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis against Model Process Framework.

Figure 18. Analysis of Trail Planning Documents vs. Model Process – St. George, UT, outlines the trail specific planning documents and compares them to the
recommended model process. Explicit evidence that specific process steps and process step outcomes have occurred are noted.

In analyzing the case against the model framework, evidence of the following are verified:

- Omission of steps from the planning process
- Patterns and/or consistency of the process steps
- Progression of the planning documents
- Level of public participation in the planning process

*Omissions* - Since St. George has not conducted trail-specific planning efforts, much of the trail related process steps recommended in the model process are not present. Most notable are the lack of establishing a vision, goals, and objectives for the trail system. Also missing is a detailed inventory and analysis of the existing and potential corridors.

*Patterns/Consistency* - No clear patterns emerge from the analysis of the planning documentation. The potential trail corridors have been identified in all of the documents. This resulted from extensive public participation in the 1994 plan.

*Progression* - The 2006 plan made significant progress in identifying the priorities for the trail system and developing potential phases and a priority list.

*Public Participation* - The 1994 plan was driven by an extensive public survey and participation process. It identified trails as a top priority and resulted in
recommendations of trails in most neighborhoods. However, there has not been evidence of a trail-specific public participation process in any of the planning documents.

*General Observations* - The trail planning in St. George does not exhibit the same level of independence from the general land-use planning as the other case studies. St. George planning was able to provide a spreadsheet that outlined each trail segment in their system, when it was built, and how it was funded. The other case study cities were not able to provide that data without extensive research that was beyond the scope of this thesis. This may offer insight into the lack of planning documentation needed to get a trail system implemented in St. George.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop the Planning Framework</td>
<td>Purpose of the planning document: Interaction with existing plans</td>
<td>Document scope was outlined.</td>
<td>Purpose is outlined.</td>
<td>This plan was prepared by a consultant. It can be inferred that the structure of the plan was discussed with city staff prior to the start of the planning process. Previous plans were reviewed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Itemization of planning document</td>
<td>No evidence of interactions with other plans.</td>
<td>Other plans mentioned throughout the document.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Public Participation Strategy</td>
<td>Task and composition of the decision-making (planning committee) and working groups</td>
<td>Extensive Public survey was taken. Using geographic districts to get accurate results.</td>
<td>No discussion of who creates the plan.</td>
<td>Brief discussion of public participation in 1995 General Plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review of existing studies, surveys, and audits</td>
<td>No extensive evidence beyond the natural history analysis.</td>
<td>No evidence of specific criteria.</td>
<td>No evidence found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Vision, Goals, and Objectives</td>
<td>Overall goals of the UTS specific actions for the planning process</td>
<td>Vision, Goals, &amp; Objectives were not explicitly stated. It was recommended that the city follow National Recreation &amp; Park Association (NRPA) standards.</td>
<td>General policies for the General Plan planning process.</td>
<td>No goals listed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Vision, Goals, &amp; Objectives were not explicitly stated. It was recommended that the city follow National Recreation &amp; Park Association (NRPA) standards.</td>
<td>No evidence of specific criteria.</td>
<td>No evidence found.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inventory and Analysis of Current Conditions</td>
<td>Natural Corridors</td>
<td>Limited conditions were inventoried but no evidence of any corridor analysis.</td>
<td>Limited conditions were inventoried but no evidence of any corridor analysis.</td>
<td>No evidence of inventory or analysis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Limited conditions were inventoried but no evidence of any corridor analysis.</td>
<td>Limited conditions were inventoried but no evidence of any corridor analysis.</td>
<td>Limited conditions and future trails were listed with action items required. They were also shown on the Urban Trail Map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Utility or Abandon Corridors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Potential Alternatives</td>
<td>Develop Design Standards</td>
<td>Recommendations were listed on a generic level to meet level of service requirements.</td>
<td>Map of future trails included.</td>
<td>Conditions were listed in specific segment models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inclusion of cross-section designs</td>
<td>No evidence of design standards.</td>
<td>No evidence of design standards.</td>
<td>No evidence of design standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate and Select Preferred Alternatives</td>
<td>Potential Evaluation Criteria: List of criteria to be included in the plan</td>
<td>No evidence of evaluation criteria for trails.</td>
<td>No evidence of evaluation criteria for trails.</td>
<td>No evidence of evaluation criteria for trails.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No prioritization criteria for given priority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>List of related trails and connections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Implementation Strategy</td>
<td>Implementation Plan: Prioritization List</td>
<td>Potential funding sources were identified. The general impact for each trail.</td>
<td>No planning or prioritization included.</td>
<td>No funding prioritization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Potential and Identified Funding Implementation responsibility</td>
<td>No planning or prioritization included.</td>
<td>No funding prioritization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No funding prioritization list.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan Approval and Adoption</td>
<td>Final Public Input: City Council/Planning Commission approval</td>
<td>No evidence of final public input or plan approval.</td>
<td>Final public review of the plan.</td>
<td>Final public review conducted for public input.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Plan presented to City Council and Planning Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Review Schedule</td>
<td>No evidence of next steps or plan evaluation.</td>
<td>No evidence of next steps or plan evaluation.</td>
<td>No evidence of next steps or plan evaluation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key: ☑ evidence found; ☐ no evidence found

Figure 18. Analysis of Trail Planning Documents vs. Model Process - St. George, UT.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS

Case Study Conclusions

Model Process Verification

There is evidence that all process steps are used as part of the planning process for each case city studied. They did not occur in each individual planning effort but they were present at some point in the planning processes throughout the years. The only process outcome that has no evidence of being used is the Evaluation Criteria outcome of the Develop Evaluation and Plan Review Process steps. There was no evidence that any of the case studies measured their performance to the plan. This validates the first part of the thesis which is developing the model process used to analyze the case studies. This also provides evidence that the recommended model process has been used and implemented in all of the case studies. In reviewing the planning documentation for all of the case studies there is no evidence to suggest the addition of process outcomes to the recommended model process. Again, this validates the research and development of the recommended model process.

Progression of Planning Efforts

In all cases current planning documents are more robust and are more complete when analyzed with the model process framework that the earlier planning processes for each city. The current planning processes contain more process outcomes than the earlier processes, suggesting a more robust planning process. In analyzing the extent to which
the model process is implemented in the case studies, one observation can be made. St. George has implemented the process to a significantly lesser degree than the other three cities. St. George showed the same progression in that their current plan is more robust than their earlier planning process when analyzed against the model process. However, when the current planning process for St. George is compared to the early planning processes of the other cities it is found to be less robust and contain less process outcomes. This suggests that there are other significant factors involved that can result in implementation of trails. It can also suggest that the process steps and process outcomes are being completed informally and not documented in the planning process. This is an area for further study.

In each case study the pace at which trails were implemented increased after the first major trail-specific planning effort. This indicates that these planning efforts either spur this trail implementation or are a result of other factors that result in the implementation of the trails.

**Robust Public Participation Process**

In reviewing the public participation efforts detailed in the planning documentation several observations can be made. First, in all of the case studies the public participation process is well integrated into the planning process. Second, the desire for trail systems is a significant need in the surveys that were conducted. The first observation shows that the public participation is a critical part of the planning process. This is why the model process recommends developing a Public Participation Strategy as one of the first steps in the planning process. This is recommended and well outlined by
Utah Department of Health in their trail planning guide. The second observation indicates that a trail-specific planning process is needed to meet the needs of the citizens. In the cases of Bend, Flagstaff, and Bellingham, the first trail-specific planning effort seemed to play a role in the implementation of trail miles on the ground.

**Early Identification of Trail Corridors**

When reviewing the cases of Bend, Flagstaff, and Bellingham it was observed that in all of the early planning efforts there was evidence that the development of a list of potential corridors was critical to the continuity of the plans going forward. In each case there appeared to be an institutionalization of the trail system. It became a significant part of future planning documents. It was reference in local, regional, and state plans. This can be identified as a critical factor in the future implementation of trails. It can drive planning, zoning, and land acquisition strategies for the city. This institutionalization or branding was most evident in the case of Flagstaff. The Flagstaff Urban Trail System (FUTS) is referenced continually since the mid 1980’s. The impact of this branding requires further study on its impact on implementation and potentially mitigating conflicts during implementation.

**Recommendations for Communities planning for Urban Trail Systems**

Smaller communities in the urban West can learn much about planning for urban trail systems from cities like Bend, Flagstaff, Bellingham, and St. George. The key factors revealed in the analysis were a robust public participation process and early identification of the trail corridors. Bend, Bellingham and Flagstaff all saw increasing rates of miles of implemented trails on the ground after beginning a trail-specific
planning effort. All the communities integrated their trail planning efforts into the broader regional land-use planning efforts.

**Future Research**

There are many factors that influence the implementation of urban trail systems in a community. The overall planning process is one of those factors. The planning process itself contains critical steps as demonstrated in this thesis. However, further research is needed to identify the influence of other factors in the implementation of urban trail systems. Those other factors may include: political climate, grassroots involvement, regional or state involvement, and possibly demographic or population based factors.

**Potential Research Opportunities**

There are opportunities for several studies that together would provide a holistic view of the factors critical to successful implementation of an urban trail system. Several opportunities that were identified during the research for this thesis are:

- A detailed study and analysis of the **public participation** process and the role it plays in implementation would help to make the planning process more robust. A study could analyze the correlation between public involvement, planning, and implementation.

- As mentioned earlier, Flagstaff created branding of their trail system that has been consistent since the 1980’s. The impact of early **trail system branding** or institutionalization needs to be studied. Are cities that continually reinforce the
need for trails more successful in implementing them? Are there less instances of conflict when implementing trail segments?

- A more detailed investigation of how cities like St. George are able to get 50 miles of trails without trail-specific planning efforts? This study could rely on detailed interview questions that probe the partners that were key in trail planning and implementation efforts. These interviews could direct more detailed research into the reasons identified by the participants.

- Research into the impact the political climate, demographics, and/or regional involvement have on trail implementation would be informative, however may not provide the same type of results as this thesis or other research. It is unlikely that these factors could be influence by trail planners and community administrators. It would tell these planners if their community has the correct mix of political or demographic factors to support successful trail system implementation.

As with much research, as many questions are raised as answers. This thesis has identified the critical factors in trail system planning, and further research could provide a holistic look at other factors that span the social, economic, and political spectrum and impact urban trail system implementation.
REFERENCES


Bend Park and Recreation District. (1981). *Comprehensive plan*. Bend, OR.

Bend Park and Recreation District. (2008). *Park & recreation trails master plan*. Bend, OR.

Bend Park and Recreation District. (2008). *Parks, recreation, and green spaces comprehensive plan*. Bend, OR.

Bend Park and Recreation District, City of Bend, Bend Park and Recreation Foundation. (2002). *Deschutes River trail action plan*. Bend, OR.

Bend Park and Recreation Foundation. (1999). *Bend riverway - A community vision*. Bend, OR.


City of Bellingham. (1994). *Open space, parks, and recreation plan*. Bellingham, WA.


City of Bellingham. (2008). *North Bellingham trail plan*. Bellingham, WA.

City of Bellingham. (2008). *Parks, recreation, and open space plan*. Bellingham, WA.
City of Bend. (1995). *Bend urban trails plan*. Bend, OR.

City of Bend, Deschutes County. (1975, 1998). *Bend area general plan*. Bend, OR.


City of Flagstaff, Coconino County. (2001). *Flagstaff area regional land use and transportation plan*. Flagstaff, AZ.

City of St. George. (1994). *Parks master plan*. St. George, UT.

City of St. George. (2006). *Parks, trails, recreation & arts master plan*. St. George, UT.


Flagstaff Parks and Recreation Division. (1996). *Long range master plan for parks, recreation and open space*. Flagstaff, AZ.


U.S. Department of Transportation - Federal Highway Administration. (1992). *Current planning guidelines and design standards being used by state and local agencies for bicycle and pedestrian facilities*. Washington, D.C.


Whatcom County. (2008). *Whatcom County comprehensive parks, recreation, and open space plan*. Bellingham, WA.

Whatcom County Parks & Recreation, Bellingham Parks & Recreation, Port of Bellingham, Whatcom County Council of Governments. (2000). *Coast millennium trail master plan*. Bellingham, WA.


APPENDICES
Appendix A. Bend Urban Trail System Map
Appendix B. Flagstaff Urban Trail System Map
Appendix C. Bellingham Urban Trail System Map
Existing Facilities Plan • Trails

1. Bay to Baker Trail
2. Cornwall Park Trails
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9. Old Village Trail
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12. South Bay Trail
13. Sehome Hill Arboretum Trails
14. Samish Crest Trails
15. Lookout Mountain Trails
16. Connelly Creek Nature Area Trails
17. Lower Padden Trails
18. Interurban Trail
19. Lake Padden & Padden Gorge Trail

Existing 1/2 mile radius

Existing Trail
Appendix D. Proposed Bellingham Trail Map
Appendix E. St. George Urban Trail System Map
Appendix F. Planning Process Quick Reference Guide
Resources

Communities across the state have a wide variety of planning expertise. For those communities that do not have the staff or resources to accomplish this type of trail-specific planning on their own there are resources available to assist in planning, community involvement, visioning, and even funding. This is just a very short list of some of the resources available and the types of organizations that can help in this effort.

Trail Planning Resources:

General Resources:
- National Park Service - Rivers, Trails, & Conservation Assistance Program - this group provides technical assistance to communities for trail planning, open space conservation, and public visioning. www.nps.gov/trav
- Local Associations of Governments (LAGOs) and Municipal Planning Organizations (MPOs) are often great resources for planning assistance.

General Funding Resources:
- Large scale projects are often funded by large organizations like the Federal Highway Administration, and the Center for Disease control. Smaller scale projects have numerous funding sources such as the Recreational Trails Program in each state. The key to unlocking these resources is to include as many organizations as possible in your planning effort. Invite the local Health Department, advocacy groups, County planning departments, land management agencies, State Parks and all interested groups.

Urban Trail System Planning: Quick Reference

The Need for Planning

As growth in Western states outpace the rest of the nation, communities are embarking on an increased level of land use planning. In many cases this includes the need to plan for Greenways and Urban Trail Systems. Successful communities are finding that having a trail-specific plan helps to build community support, focus implementation efforts, and prioritize community needs.

This guide outlines a process to be used to create a trail-specific plan. It is a quick reference guide designed to enlighten the public and elected officials on the complexity of the process. It provides short descriptions of the steps in the process and lists the expected outcomes. It also highlights 3 key factors that can help ensure long-term success of the planning effort.

Benefits of Trails
-Trail systems can bring many benefits to communities.
-They can:
  - Help build community
  - Improve health of the residents
  - Help educate children about nature
  - Add to economic development
  - Increase property values
  - Provide alternative transportation
  - Improve ecology

Urban Trail System Planning: Planning Process

The semi-expected for the process. It gains everyone in the public elected officials, the planning department) on the same page about what the process means.

Develop a Vision, Goals, and Objectives

By developing not only a Vision and Goals, but also objectives, progress can be measured and implementation steps can begin.

Develop Potential Alternatives

This highlights needed coordination and can highlight “key areas” for the initial phases of implementation. It also highlights connections with potential to make connections.

Inventory and Analysis of Current Conditions

Looking at all data from the planning process to identify what is important to the community.

Establish a Public Participation Strategy

Understanding the short and long term timekeeping the process. The public and elected officials can react to a problem.

Develop Implementation Strategy

Having a scheduled review of the plan and what to do for the process allow and does not allow time to diminish the success of the plan.

3 Key Factors to Long-term Success

Follow a trail-specific Planning Process

Successful communities have looked at trail planning as it’s own planning process. This keeps trail implementation from getting diluted within other planning documents and processes.

Develop a robust Public Participation Plan

In today’s climate public meetings are only one of many ways to ensure the public is involved in the process. Social media, websites, blogs, and discussion boards can ensure a broad spectrum of input.

Identify Potential Corridors Early

Successful communities have identified corridors early in the process and have institutionalized them into the planning process giving long-term implementation a fighting chance.
Resources

Communities across the west have a wide variety of planning expertise. For those communities that do not have the staff or resources to accomplish this type of trail-specific planning on their own there are resources available to assist in planning, community involvement, visioning, and even funding. This is just a very short list of some of the resources available and the types of organizations that can help in this effort.

Trail Planning Resources:

Utah Department of Health - Utah Bicycle & Pedestrian Master Plan Design Guide

Chester County, Pennsylvania - Trail & Path Planning: A Guide for Municipalities
http://www.chesco.org/planning/cwp/view.asp?a=1676&q=646859

General Resources:

National Park Service - Rivers, Trails, & Conservation Assistance Program - this group provides technical assistance to communities for trail planning, open space conservation, and public visioning. www.nps.gov/rca

Local Associations of Governments (AGO’s) and Municipal Planning Organizations (MPO’s) are often great resources for planning assistance.

General Funding Resources:

Large scale projects are often funded by large organizations like the Federal Highway Administration, and the Center for Disease control. Smaller scale projects have numerous funding sources such as the Recreational Trails Program in each state. The key to unlocking these sources is to include as many organizations as possible in your planning effort. Invite the local Health Department, advocacy groups, County planning departments, land management agencies, State Parks and all interested groups.

Urban Trail System Planning: Quick Reference

The Need for Planning

As growth in Western states outpace the rest of the nation, communities are embarking on an increased level of land-use planning. In many cases this includes the need to plan for Greenways and Urban Trail Systems.

Successful communities are finding that having a trail-specific plan helps to: build community support, focus implementation efforts, and prioritize community needs.

This guide outlines a process to be used to create a trail-specific plan. It is a quick reference guide designed to enlighten the public and elected officials on the complexity of the process. It provides short descriptions of the steps in the process and lists the expected outcomes. It also highlights 3 key factors that can help ensure long-term success of the planning effort.

Benefits of Trails

Trail systems can bring many benefits to communities. They can:

- Help build community
- Improve health of the residents
- Help educate children about nature
- Aid in economic development
- Increase property values
- Provide alternative transportation
- Improve ecology
Urban Trail System Planning: Planning Process

This sets expectations for the process. It gets everyone (the public, elected officials, the planning department) on the same page about what this process means.

Developing a Public Participation Strategy is essential to ensuring everyone is involved. Gone are the days of just public meetings. Think Facebook, websites, collaboration.

By developing not only a Vision and Goals, but also objectives, progress can be measured and implementation steps can begin.

This highlights needed connections and can highlight “easy wins” for the initial phases of implementation. It also highlights corridors with potential to make connections.

Looking at all alternatives promotes dialog between stakeholders and involves the public in the decision making process.

Highlighting this in the plan promotes transparency in the process and reduces conflicts later in the process. A prioritization criteria helps to clearly define what is important to the community.

Understanding the short and long term timing keeps the process moving. The public and elected officials can relate to a priority list.

Formally adopting and approving the plan promotes ownership among the elected officials typically charged with supporting the implementation of the plan.

Having a scheduled review of the plan and a method to evaluate success keeps the document and the process alive and does not allow time to diminish the support of the plan.

3 Key Factors to Long-term Success

Follow a trail-specific Planning Process

Successful communities have looked at trail planning as its own planning process. This keeps trail system implementation from getting diluted within other planning documents and processes.

Develop a robust Public Participation Plan

In today's climate public meetings are only one of many ways to ensure the public is involved in the process. Social media, websites, blogs, and discussion boards can ensure a broad spectrum of input.

Identify Potential Corridors Early

Successful communities have identified corridors early in the process and have institutionalized them into the planning process giving long-term implementation a fighting chance.